



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,155	02/06/2008	Chi Wan Hur	0465-1506PUS1	6014
2292 7590 01/27/2011 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
KLING, CHARLES				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1711				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/27/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/564,155

Applicant(s)

HUR, CHI WAN

Examiner

Charles W. Kling

Art Unit

1711

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendments and arguments received 11-29-10.
2. Claims **1, 3-10** are pending.
3. Claims **2, 11-21** were cancelled in the amendment dated 11-29-10.
4. Claims **1-10** were rejected in the previous action.
5. Claim **1** was objected to in the previous action.

Response to Amendments

Specification

6. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment to the title; the amended title is accepted by the examiner.
7. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment to pages 1, 3, 7-8, 12 of the specification. It has been determined that no new matter has been entered.
8. Examiner acknowledges that the recited limitations are disclosed on page 13 of the specification.
9. The objections to the specification in the previous action are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

10. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment to claim **1**. It has been determined that no new matter has been entered.
11. The objection to claim **1** in the previous action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment to claim 10. It has been determined that no new matter has been entered.
13. The rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, in the previous action is hereby withdrawn.

Other Amendments

14. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendments to claims 1, 3, 10; and the cancellation of claims 2, 11-21. It has been determined that no new matter has been entered.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant contends that the push-in portion (72) is rectangular.
16. This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.
17. Both figure 5 and figure 7 show the push-in portion to be square.
18. As such, the drawings stand objected to as stated below and in the previous action.
19. Applicant contends that both the depressed portion (84) and the holding portion (83) are depicted in the drawing.
20. This argument has been fully considered and is found persuasive.

21. Figure 8 does appear to show both elements. However, the depressed portion is not labeled in figure 8.
22. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the elements of original claim 2 as well as additional limitations.
23. Regarding amended claim 1, applicant contends that the cited references, INADA ET AL. (JP 60-176693) and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. (US 6,200,155), do not disclose the elements of the amended claim. Specifically, applicant contends that the plug and power cord orientation disclosed by CHUDKOSKY ET AL. prevent the teachings of CHUDKOSKY ET AL. from being applied to INADA ET AL.
24. This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.
25. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).
26. In this case, CHUDKOSKY ET AL. is being relied upon for the teaching of a recess in an appliance cabinet which accommodates a fitting of a power cord. The use of such a cabinet recess is known in the art, as shown by CHUDKOSKY ET AL., as such it would have been obvious to one of skill in that art at the time of the invention to make use of a cabinet recess as needed for appliance design and construction.

27. Applicant's amendment has necessitated a new ground of rejection for claim 1, as stated below.
28. Regarding claims **3-10**, applicant contends that these dependent claims are allowable based on the argument that the independent claim is allowable.
29. This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.
30. As stated above, applicant's arguments regarding independent claim 1 are not persuasive. As such, claims 3-10 stand rejected, as stated below and in the previous action.

Drawings

31. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show "the push-in portion has a shape in conformity with the hole" as described in line 1 of page 2 of the specification. The push-in portion (element 8 of figure 2) is shown as a square, which is not in conformity with the rectangular hole (element 12 of figure 2). Similarly, the push-in portions (element 72 of figures 5, 7) are not shown "to have a shape the same with the hole" as described in lines 6-7 of page 9 and lines 3-4 of page 12 of the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d).
32. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

34. The elements of the claims are anticipated, disclosed, and/or taught by the relevant prior art as cited in parenthesis and bold type.

35. Claims **1, 3-4, 6-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over INADA ET AL. (JP 60-176693) (see English abstract made of record 07-27-10 and attached English translation) in view of CHUDKOSKY ET AL. (US 6,200,155).

36. With regard to claim 1: INADA ET AL. discloses a washing machine (**title**) that includes a power cord attachment member (**element 21 of figure 5**) with a circumferential groove; and a cord through-hole with panel ribs (corresponding to the depressed portion) (**element 22 of figure 5**) which fit into the groove of the attachment member (**as shown in figure 5**).

37. INADA ET AL. does not appear to explicitly/expressly disclose the washing machine having a recess at a portion having the through-hole.

38. However, CHUDKOSKY ET AL. discloses a power cord connector assembly for an appliance (**title**) that includes a recessed area (**element 79 of figures 2-3, 5**) accommodating a power cord holding member (**element 25 of figure 1**) such that the holding member is not exposed to the rear of the cabinet.

39. At the time of the invention, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the washing machine of INADA ET AL. to include the recess of CHUDKOSKY ET AL., since the recess serves to maximize overall compactness and direct water away from the electrical inlet, as taught by CHUDKOSKY ET AL. (**lines 57-61 of column 1**).

40. With regard to claim 3: CHUDKOSKY ET AL. discloses the recess having a depth to accommodate the power cord holding member (**lines 21-25 of column 3, recess depth shown in figures 1-2**).

41. With regard to claim 4: INADA ET AL. discloses the attachment member (**element 21 of figure 5**) having a push-in portion held by the inner side of the panel and a sealing portion in close contact with the outer side of the panel (**inner push-in**

portion and outer sealing portion form the groove of the attachment member as shown in figure 5).

42. With regard to claim 6: INADA ET AL. discloses the groove having a width greater than the thickness of the cabinet **(as shown in figure 5).**

43. With regard to claim 7: INADA ET AL. discloses the rib **(element 22 of figure 5)** of the cabinet panel to be step-shaped and oriented towards the inner side of the cabinet **(as shown in figure 5).**

44. Claims 5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 above, and further in view of GOODWIN (US 2,711,522).

45. With regard to claim 5: INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. do not appear to explicitly/expressly disclose the push-in portion and hole to be rectangular.

46. However, GOODWIN discloses a panel mounted electrical plug connector **(title)** that includes a rectangular hole **(element 2 of figure 2)** and push-in portion **(rectangular push-in portion composed of elements 3, 11, 18 in figure 1).**

47. At the time of the invention, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the washing machine of INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. to include the rectangular hole and push-in portion of GOODWIN, since the shape of the hole and push-in portion would have been an obvious matter of design choice motivated by aesthetics or other design factors.

48. With regard to claim 8: INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. do not appear to explicitly/expressly disclose the attachment member being formed of elastic material.

49. However, GOODWIN discloses the push-in portion of the connector being elastically deformed (**as shown in figure 6**).

50. At the time of the invention, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the washing machine of INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. to include the elastic holding member of GOODWIN, since one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known that elastic rubber fittings are commonly used in the art to secure electrical wires or cords.

51. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 above, and further in view of COFFEY (US PG-Pub 2005/0250379).

52. With regard to claim 9: INADA ET AL. does not appear to explicitly/expressly disclose the depressed portion further including a holding portion.

53. However, COFFEY discloses a hole adaptor for receiving electrical couplers (**abstract**) that includes a depressed portion (**element 150 of figure 8**) with a holding portion (**element 152 of figure 8**).

54. At the time of the invention, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the washing machine of INADA ET AL. and CHUDKOSKY ET AL. to include the depressed portion with holding portion of COFFEY, since one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known that adding a

holding portion to the depressed portion would provide holding redundancy and serve to further insure the retention of the power cord assembly.

55. With regard to claim **10**: COFFEY discloses the holding portion (**element 152 of figure 8**) to be projected toward the inner side of a panel (**as shown in figure 9**).

Conclusion

56. The objections to the title and specification, stated in the previous action, are hereby withdrawn.

57. The drawings stand objected to, as stated above and in the previous action.

58. The claim objection stated in the previous action is hereby withdrawn.

59. The claim rejection under 35 USC 112, stated in the previous action, is hereby withdrawn.

60. Claims **1, 3-10** stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as stated above and in the previous action; these rejections are hereby made FINAL.

61. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

62. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

63. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles W. Kling, whose telephone number is 571-270-5524. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 - 4:30 EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the examiner's supervisor, Michael E. Barr, can be reached at 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles W. Kling/
Examiner, Art Unit 1711

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1711

